

Montana Criminal Justice Information Services Project

Local Pilot Project



INTERIM REPORT NCHIP GRANT #95-H12-80334

November 13, 2002
Wilbur W. Rehmann, MCJISP Manager

Executive Summary

The Local Pilot Project has provided the most complete picture yet of the criminal justice information data flow between local law enforcement, prosecutors, clerks and custodial agencies and the state central repository. We were able to observe and document the unique operations of each city/county and each criminal justice agency within that local jurisdiction. It is clear that 56 different counties and multiple cities means that there currently is no standardized method of moving information on the local level in Montana. It is not chaos because local criminal justice practitioners have created informal ways of getting information and passing it on to the next recipient. Until we are able to provide either a legislative solution to these myriad methodologies or a compelling reason to standardize, Montana will continue to have many different ways of moving criminal justice information.

1. The first conclusion we can draw from the Local Pilot Project is that rural counties have a special set of problems:

- Courthouse network wiring is old and made up of different grades or categories of wiring and needs to be replaced in order to provide a stable and efficient electronic network. As a result government offices have unreliable and unstable computer use. Replacement wiring costs could run from approximately \$12,000 to \$20,000.

- Most rural counties do not have their own IT staff and rely on local computer users or local computer entrepreneurs for some if not all of the hardware/software and network maintenance.

- Rural counties have limited budgets set aside for Information Technology whether it is for replacement of older hardware/software or for maintenance. State hardware/software standards may not be met.

Glacier County rewiring and upgrading Court connections to Summitnet provides a model for future use by DOA-ITSD and Court Administrator's office for hardware and software changes necessary to bring counties into compliance with state standards and to meet network security requirements. The cost to upgrade the wiring to state standards, Category 5, was approximately \$12,000, but the contractor lost money on the contract and therefore \$12,000 to \$20,000 is a better estimate of costs.

Based on the Glacier County rebuild, court hardware and software changes may include the following: Ethernet cards, NT license for Advanced Revelation, Bay Hub Switch, new Summitnet connections. Costs for these additional items were approximately \$9,000.

Most rural counties in Montana have similar Information Technology needs as those found in Glacier County.

2. Security outside the main statewide Summitnet network is a troublesome issue. Connections to Summitnet by state agencies are often dictated by costs and such arrangements may not always be secure. In addition, since many counties have a part-

time County Attorney who is located in a separate building some blocks away, direct wire connection to Summitnet may not be feasible.

3. The use by District Court Clerks in Glacier and Lewis and Clark County has been a significant positive step forward in efficiency of entry, accuracy of data and the linking of Court dispositions with MANS in the Criminal History Record System. Both District Court Clerks like the ease of entry and have stated that it makes up for the need to also enter disposition information into the Court Administrator's Office JCMS system. Clerks also benefit with the elimination of handling the MANS form, the amount of actual "paperwork" is reduced. The CJIS Bureau Audit staff continues to monitor use by Clerks and in each audit cycle the Clerks have received high ratings for accuracy. The benefit to the Criminal History Record System is that accurate dispositions are now received instantly with virtually no delay.

The MCJISP recommends expanding the use of direct disposition entry by Clerks to other counties and offices, while recognizing that "one size fits all" will not work in every county. Each Montana county will need to be assessed on its' own and a plan tailored to a particular county's needs.

The MCJISP also recommends continuing to discuss with Court Administrator's office how to resolve the double entry of disposition information problem and to continue to explore batch disposition reporting.

Other more detailed recommendations are contained in the Phase II Business Practices Analysis report, pages 2.1 through 2.11, which is attached to this document as Appendix D.

MCJISP Local Pilot Project Report

Background

In 1999, the Advisory Group identified a “missing link” in efforts of the state to modernize, automate and integrate its’ criminal justice information services. The “missing link” is in getting information electronically from local prosecutors and courts and further that as efforts to automate and integrate at the state level have progressed well, local efforts at integration have fallen behind.

In an effort to move integration forward the MCJISP submitted a grant proposal to NCHIP for a Local Pilot Project and the grant application states:

“The goal of the MCJISP Local Pilot Project is to move the criminal justice information integration and automation efforts forward by selecting two counties; one urban and one rural, in which a pilot project could be conducted. The Pilot Project would be conducted cooperatively with local public safety and criminal justice information users/providers. The project would plan and implement a local integration and automation system in Lewis and Clark County and the City of Helena and Glacier County and the town of Cut Bank.”

Further, the project proposed:

“By demonstrating in two very different counties and cities and towns the benefits of greater accuracy and efficiency in automated and integrated criminal justice information flow the department hopes to provide a demonstration model that could be adopted by all counties and cities in the state. Grant funds will be used to provide necessary hardware, application software and network servers.”

On 12/17/99 the MCJISP was awarded a \$103,000.00 grant for a local pilot project by the Board of Crime Control as part of the National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP). The project objectives are to work in partnership with local criminal justice agencies to:

Evaluate the needs of local and state agencies that use criminal history and other criminal justice information systems;

Explore the best methods for collecting, storing and disseminating this information through an integrated/coordinated approach; and

Develop cost effective and workable responses to user demands and to legislative mandates.

Local Pilot Project Implementation Plan

Lewis and Clark County

Beginning in January 2000, MCJISP Project Manager Wilbur Rehmann and CJIS Bureau Chief Karen Nelson began meeting with local criminal justice agency staff in Lewis and Clark County to solicit their support and participation in the Pilot Project. We presented the principles of integration, as provided by SEARCH which are:

- Data should be captured at the originating point, rather than trying to reconstruct it down the line or have others capture it.
- Data should be captured once and used many times, leveraging existing resources and improving data quality.
- The integrated system should be driven by the operational systems of the participating agencies, not separate from the systems supporting the agencies.
- The capabilities for generalized automatic query, push, pull, publish and subscription must be constructed as general capabilities of the system.

Local Agencies represented at these meetings included the following:

- Lewis and Clark County Sheriff's Office
- Helena Police Department
- City Court Clerk
- Justice of the Peace
- District Court Clerk
- County Administrator
- City Manager
- County Attorney
- County IT Staff

State agencies represented at the meetings included Probation and Parole, DOC, Supreme Court Administrators office and the Board of Crime Control, NIBRs staff.

Phase I of the Local Pilot was to solicit participation and to research the needs of local criminal justice agencies about criminal justice information and the flow of that information through the local agencies. The contractor would document the flow of data, beginning with the initial arrest and following through to custody. We began to identify problems that local agencies had with the DOJ created MANS sheet and the movement of this information through local agencies.

During this phase of the project we identified workload problems by the District Court Clerk, County Attorney, Justice of the Peace and local law enforcement with the MANS sheet. Frustration was expressed that it was one more form to fill out and it didn't provide any immediate benefit to the participants. They agreed that the information was

important to maintain by DOJ and then returned via the CHRS and used by local prosecutors, law enforcement, probation and parole and court clerks. We continued to meet with Lewis and Clark County and Helena city participants through summer 2000, to survey their needs and get their ideas for possible business practice solutions to criminal justice information flow.

CJIN software was installed in the County Attorney's office and the District Court Clerks office in the 2001 in the fall. A training program was developed by the CJIS Bureau Audit and Training staff, Michelle Kavanaugh and Marv Formo. The District Court Clerk's office began entering disposition data directly into the Criminal History Record System in November 2001. The County Attorney's office began utilizing CJIN to look up criminal history information at the same time.

In January, Karen Nelson and Wilbur Rehmann met with Nancy Sweeney, L&C District Court Clerk and Leo Gallagher to assess CJIN use and to make an initial evaluation of disposition entry. The County Attorney reported that his office was too swamped with caseload to be able to enter the charges filed into the criminal history record at this time. If the office received more clerical help he would reconsider the idea at that time. But, the prosecutor's office was very appreciative of being able to look up the criminal history record directly in his office.

By entering dispositions directly into the Criminal History Record System via CJIN, the District Court Clerk also has to enter similar but more detailed disposition information into the Court's JCMS system. Nancy Sweeney reported that she is willing to try this approach because the benefit to her office is the elimination of processing the MANS sheet. This more than makes up for the work involved in entering disposition information twice. She also reported that in order to get the "batch" dispositions from her office to the Court Administrators office it takes about 5 hours of download time. She recommended discontinuing the download requirement if we were willing to proceed with direct disposition entering via CJIN. We agreed to continue the pilot and see if it continues to significantly reduce the Clerk's office workload.

County Attorney Leo Gallagher agreed to enter information when his office decides not to file charges against someone into the criminal history system but couldn't commit to entering charges filed into the system. We agreed to revisit this issue when the caseload lightens up and/or the office gets more clerical help.

The CJIS Bureau Audit staff continues to audit and monitor use by the Clerk's and County Attorney's offices in fall 2002.

Glacier County

In summer 2000, Karen Nelson and Wilbur Rehmann began meeting with Glacier County criminal justice agency representatives in Cut Bank and explained the local pilot project and invited them to participate. They were very supportive and the following agencies agreed:

- Glacier County Sheriff's Office
- County Dispatcher
- Cut Bank Police Department
- City Court Clerk
- District Court Clerk
- County Attorney
- Justice Court Clerk
- Probation and Parole Office

Glacier County presented some initial technical problems, the County Attorney was part-time and his office was located in a private business three blocks from the County Courthouse. Cut Bank Police Department and City Court were located in a separate city-owned building three blocks from the Courthouse and across the street from the County Attorney's office. Any electronic information proposal would have to take these physical limitations into account.

We surveyed the criminal justice agencies to determine their needs and solicit their ideas. In the course of this phase of the project we also surveyed other state and local agency offices in the courthouse about their technology uses and concerns. Glacier County does not provide any professional information technology service to the state and local agencies in the courthouse. The county maintenance superintendent was self-taught in basic pc computer hardware and software and provided some minimal technical assistance to the agencies.

In early 2001, Carl Hotvedt, ISD-DOA and Dana Corson, Court Administrator's office participated in meetings with Glacier County and Cut Bank criminal justice representatives. Local agencies identified numerous network problems including periodic outages of the network. In addition, network security holes were discovered in tracing the District Court Clerks network set-up that included both a connection to the state network, Summitnet, and a modem to a separate ISP on another court networked computer. This network setup would give any person with minimal hacker skills to access the entire state network through the one court computer. This raised the question of using Glacier County as a pilot county. The consensus of the state and local agency representatives was to proceed because Glacier County was not unique in this type of networking set up and the county could provide an excellent model for other rural counties.

A second team of network specialists was brought in to evaluate what would be needed to bring Glacier County up to state standards and Dan Hawkins, DOJ and Charlie Ball, ISD-DOA conducted a detailed review of the local network setup. They recommended that wiring in the Courthouse be upgraded to Category 5 standards that would involve 16 state connections and 20 county connections. Their proposal is included as Appendix A. In addition, Dana Corson estimated the cost of upgrading the District Court computers to comply with network and security standards of Summitnet and CJIN. Corson estimated that it would take a hardware upgrade to the existing NT server in the Courthouse and six

additional Ethernet cards, two Ethernet jetdirects and nine Summitnet connection licenses for District and Justice Courts. That estimate is included as Appendix B.

MCJISP submitted a budget amendment to the original Local Pilot Grant to enable the project to continue with rewiring the Courthouse to meet state standards and upgrading the court computers and servers. The total estimate for this budget admendment was approximately \$24,000. DOA-ISD issued an RFP for the project and received a low bid of \$12,000 for rewiring and the Court Administrators office submitted a cost of \$8,600 to upgrade the computers and servers for the District Court office. The final budget amendment of \$20,000 was approved for these upgrades.

The rewiring and hardware and software upgrades were installed and inspected in the fall of 2001.

There were two remaining open issues before the complete Glacier County pilot project would be in place for use; first, installing and training the District Court Clerk on CJIN, and second, resolving the best way to connect the Cut Bank Police Department and city court and the county attorney to the network.

Testing of the network upgrades and connections occurred in December 2001– March 2002 in Glacier County. The Court Administrator’s office connected the District Court Clerk’s office to the state network in March 2002 and assigned a state address to the District Court clerk.

Diane Anderson, Glacier County District Court Clerk, attended the March 2002 SEARCH Information Integration Symposium with other members of the Montana team. She attended the one-day project management workshop at the Symposium.

In January 2002, the Department of Administration, ITSD, announced that they would undertake a pilot project for a new Virtual Private Network (VPN) installation for the state. MCJISP submitted the Glacier County project to be a VPN pilot under the ITSD installation. The VPN installation would solve the security issues of connecting the County Attorney’s office and the Cut Bank Police Department to Summitnet. The MCJISP would provide a Cyberlinxx, web connection to Summitnet and CJIN and the VPN would provide requisite security for this connection. Shawn Kornec, DOJ-ITSD was in charge of working with DOA-ITSD and Glacier County to install and test the VPN.

In July 2002, CJIS Bureau staff, Walt Joyce and Michelle Kavanaugh and MCJISP Manager Wilbur Rehmann met with all the Glacier County pilot participants to evaluate the results of the network rebuild, install CJIN software and train staff, and discuss the VPN changes and other changes or additions/deletions to the pilot project. The Cut Bank Police Court Clerk suggested installing CJIN on her computer because she enters Partner and Family member abuse citations. The District Court and Justice Court offices had CJIN installed and the staff in both offices was trained.

Installing CJIN in the Cut Bank Police Dept. and the County Attorney's office would have to wait until after the VPN is installed and tested. The VPN was tested in July-August 2002 and technical problems identified. The Cut Bank Police Department was hooked up to the VPN and successfully communicated with CJIN in September. The County Attorney is connected via a different ISP and there are still some technical problems to resolve before that office will be full operational.

Business Practices Analysis

MCJISP submitted a grant adjustment to the Board of Crime Control to assess the business practices in the two counties under the pilot project. The MCJISP contracted with TRW, Inc. to conduct a Business Practices Analysis of the Local Pilot Project in two phases. Phase I of the plan would be conducted in six weeks from October – November 2001. The Phase I work plan, attached as Appendix C, contained the following items to be used as the basis for interviews with criminal justice information users in Lewis and Clark and Glacier Counties:

- 1. Identification of events that trigger the exchange of criminal history information between local and state agencies*
- 2. Confirmation of agencies involved in the exchange of information*
- 3. Identification of the nature and content of information exchanged.*
- 4. Description of business practices rules governing the current exchange of information.*

This analysis focused on the following, common amongst criminal justice agencies, components and data sets:

- 1. Arrest/Fingerprint Data*
- 2. Charges*
- 3. Dispositions*

The MCJISP Manager set up all the interviews for Lewis and Clark and Glacier Counties and with the state CJIS Bureau, Court Administrators office and DOC Probation and Parole.

Findings in Phase I of the Business Practices Analysis are summarized as follows:

- 1. The MANS sheet and fingerprint cards, while not the only documents exchanged between local criminal justice agencies, are nevertheless integral parts of the exchange process. The officials interviewed in both counties were very familiar with the MANS sheet and understood the importance of sending the data to the CJIS central repository.*
- 2. Key records management officials in both counties are making serious efforts to comply with the state's requirements for submissions to the central repository.*

They expressed a willingness to participate in this analysis in order to improve reporting processes and to make changes to enhance accuracy and timeliness.

- 3. Local records management systems are not integrated with the process of compiling the criminal history information for the state, nor do these systems support the exchange of this information among local agencies. Although Lewis & Clark County and the City of Helena have joined to begin implementation of a new public safety and records management system, this effort is not yet integrated with court automation efforts. Agencies in Glacier County and Cut Bank have older systems that are entirely stand-alone. The County Attorneys currently have no automated systems.*
- 4. As a result of the lack of system integration at both the local and state levels, the exchange of critical criminal history information occurs entirely in paper form. The only exception to this is the pilot project now underway at the District Court in Lewis & Clark County for the input of disposition data directly into the central repository.*
- 5. Business practices, as opposed to formal business rules, are used to move the MANS sheet and fingerprint cards from one agency to another. Informal procedures have been developed through the years that incorporate both the instructions from the CJIS Bureau and the particular working relationships between local law enforcement, prosecutors, and the courts. Because of the high level of cooperation among the agencies in these two counties, these informal processes appear to be fairly successful in moving routine information to the appropriate parties.*

The most significant gaps in the flow information are caused by:

- 1. Use of outdated instructions from the CJIS Bureau for the processing of MANS numbers, MANS sheets, and fingerprint cards. An example would be requesting MANS numbers for out-of-jurisdiction arrests using the booking agency's ORI.*
- 2. Lack of understanding on the part of the arresting officer or booking staff about the offenses that are reportable to the CJIS central repository; this is particularly true of less common types of arrests, such as those for Contempt of Court and No Bond warrants.*
- 3. Lack of prosecutor input in the MANS sheet. The County Attorneys do not use the forms and are not very familiar with them; they rely on the courts to handle the MANS sheet, but the courts do not fill in the prosecutor charges portion.*

4. *Lack of reliable methods to identify individuals that have not been booked prior to court action.*
5. *Lack of reliable methods to report changes to dispositions, such as appeals, deferrals, and post-conviction relief. There is no mechanism in place to trigger the exchange of this information with the CJIS central repository at the same time it is entered into court records.*
6. *Misunderstandings of processing by other agencies; in other words, one agency's staff may think they know what is going on in another agency, but the two agencies are looking at the same information from different perspectives.*
7. *Time requirements for reporting data to the state are not incorporated into local processing practices; however, the courts that were interviewed are mailing reports to the CJIS central repository on a daily or weekly basis.*

The Phase II report, attached as Appendix D, reviewed the business practices identified in Phase I and identified the following planning considerations:

Issues Related to MANS Numbers

Records submitted to the central repository for events that have not been assigned a MANS number.

MANS numbers without subsequent information in the criminal history cycle.

Poor linkage between records with MANS numbers in the central repository and records compiled by the Supreme Court Administrator's Office (SCAO) from a local JCMS database.

Incorrect ORIs applied to an arrest when multiple jurisdictions use the same booking facility.

County Attorney ORI not identified in multi-county District Courts.

Issues Related to the Receipt of Arrest and Fingerprint Data

MANS numbers requested and fingerprint cards submitted for non-serious offenses, Federal holds or arrests, prisoner transports, and Contempt of Court arrests related to civil cases.

Fingerprint cards submitted without associated MANS numbers.

MANS number requests for Probation and Parole jail sanctions, which are not maintainable.

Fingerprint cards submitted for identification purposes without being marked as ident-only.

High-level turnover in jail personnel, leading to a knowledge gap.

Missing data fields on the fingerprint card.

Confusion on how to submit additional charges to an arrest.

Submissions for Conspiracy and Attempt without the original charge listed.

Listing a modification to a charge as a separate charge.

Issues Related to Prosecutor Data

Proportion of records received with prosecutor data is estimated at between 1-10%.

Inability to track the charges through the entire criminal history cycle without the prosecutor data.

Charges that remain open on criminal history records because the central repository may not have disposition data when a prosecutor declines to file charges.

Amended charges (such as a misdemeanor amended to a felony charge) may not be forwarded to the central repository until the final disposition is forwarded by the court; this delay can cause a gap in the individual's record that may impact licensing and/or permit eligibility.

Issues Related to Court Data

Problems linking records in JCMS electronically with the CHRI records.

Lack of standard practices on handling the submission of final disposition data on appeals.

Lack of input of sentencing conditions into court systems.

Missing or confusing records regarding deferred imposition of sentences and deferred prosecutions.

Lack of follow-up data on dismissals after deferrals.

Free-form text on MANS sheets that is inconsistent with other data on the form; free-text descriptions for a disposition can differ from court to court or within a court.

Lack of information on the movement of a case from one court to another.

Mismatches between the literal description of a statute and the statutory reference listed.

Cases split between justice and district court resulting in confusion about whether the arrest cycle is still open or should be closed.

Post-conviction relief information not forwarded to the central repository to update the court disposition.

Issues Related to Corrections Data

No set procedure or business rule at the department level for how arrests related to probation violations and jail sanctions are to be handled with respect to information due to the central repository.

Problems linking the corrections segment with a specific arrest and disposition, possibly due to inconsistency in the presentation of the court docket number.

Phase II summarized the data gaps for planning as:

Despite good working relationships among the various agencies involved in the interviews, the understanding that one agency has of another's processes and procedures can be incorrect or outdated. It is not uncommon for agencies

to use slightly different terms for data or events, causing confusion on what data is actually required and increasing the potential for gaps in processing.

Based on observations during the Phase I analysis, the business practices governing the creation and transfer of data at the local level appear to be guided not by established business rules but by more informal, generally accepted procedures that have been developed through the years.

Training and retraining efforts can have a positive effect on local agencies, but staffing limitations act as a constraint on the ability to do regular training. Information gleaned from the interviews indicates that some procedures used at the local level reflect outdated instructions from earlier training sessions.

According to the CJIS Bureau, the capability and willingness to submit required data to the central repository varies statewide. This could be a result of staffing limitations (understaffing, poor training, or high turnover) at the local level, but it could also be caused by a misunderstanding the state's requirements and needs.

The type of automated systems and system functionality varies significantly from agency to agency.

Because of the lack of integrated or electronic systems, the exchange of critical criminal history information occurs entirely in paper form.

The prosecutor data portion of the criminal history cycle is rarely reported to the state.

There is no statewide system for prosecutors and there are currently no plans for a unified system.

The courts have increasingly taken on the task of linking MANS numbers with court docket numbers but this is done as a manual check and is not automatic.

The critical links between the arrest and the disposition are the MANS number and the court docket number. Formatting differences used by individual courts can lead to linkage problems. In addition, documents frequently received by the CJIS bureau do not always include these links. In these cases, linkage requires research by CJIS Bureau staff.

The court systems are state-mandated and are not integrated with local systems.

Time requirements for submissions to the state are not formally incorporated into these procedures.

There do not appear to be any time requirements for the exchange of data between agencies at the local level.

Specific business rules do not exist at the state level in the Department of Corrections for processing criminal history data related to probation violation cases.

In addition, the Phase II report lists the following Strengths, Weaknesses and Opportunities:

Strengths

1. Some of the larger jurisdictions in the state have integrated public safety/records management programs in place or in planning stages; some of the County Attorneys are also implementing new Records Management Systems
2. The implementation of new court software at Courts of Limited Jurisdiction is underway
3. MANS Numbers and MANS sheets are well integrated into processing of CHR at the local level
4. Nearly two-thirds of the MANS and fingerprint submissions come from only 15 jurisdictions
5. In the counties surveyed in this analysis, there is substantial willingness to work with the state to improve the quality of criminal history data
6. Training efforts by the CJIS Bureau can have a positive impact on the quality and timeliness of data submitted to the state

Weaknesses

1. There is no statewide inventory of current systems and IT environments
2. Local integration efforts do not incorporate corresponding state systems, such as the systems administered by the Supreme Court Administrator's Office for local courts
3. Smaller jurisdictions do not have access to resources to improve communication, data systems and intra-agency integration efforts
4. There are no plans for a unified, statewide prosecutor system and very little data is provided by prosecutors on the MANS sheets
5. The links between CHRS and JCMS have not been very successful to date, although the electronic transfer of data was successful
6. There are no shared standards on a statewide basis for criminal justice terminology (such as events and statute "literals") and for common data needs, leading to misunderstandings and inconsistency in the treatment of data
7. Criminal history data is shared primarily in paper form among local agencies and the state
8. Business practices directing the exchange of criminal history information are informal and the interpretation of existing processes varies from agency to agency

9. The key data sets/data elements that are not always received by the repository include:

- Prosecutor Charges
- Changes to judgments (deferrals, post-conviction relief)
- Appeals
- Corrections to MANS requests that were in error (non-maintainable)
- Dispositions for cases split between two courts

Opportunities

1. The new MCJISP Planning Committee offers a platform for the development of policies and priorities for integration efforts
2. Integration efforts such as the one currently underway in Lewis & Clark County and the City of Helena are excellent opportunities to develop a model for improving data exchange points, as well as an opportunity to develop shared business rules for data exchanges
3. If staff time becomes available, there are several steps that could be taken to improve data collection in the near term; these steps include updating the CJIS Bureau's training instructions
4. CJIS staff time is taken up with data entry chores that will decrease substantially when the NEC TC has been successfully installed.
5. The initial positive results of the CJIN M*ECourt screens installed in Lewis & Clark County provide a test case for evaluation of this option or some variation
6. IT advancements in the MTDOJ and its CJIS partners offer an opportunity for creative solutions

Business Practices Phase II CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Problem 1: Moving MANS Data through the Criminal History Cycle

Option 1: Expand the use of CJIN M*ECourt Screens in local courts and M*EProsecutor screens in prosecutors' offices.

- Advantages:
 - CJIN Terminals are available to all jurisdictions; Linxx 2010 is a proven application already in place in limited locations
 - Input is made directly into CHRS by originating agency
 - Could allow entry of prosecutor data if County Attorney has Internet access
 - Allows view of CHR as well as input to CHR (note: Courts may not want CHR data access)
- Challenges:
 - CJIN terminal costs may be excessive for this type of use
 - Internet access by local agencies is required for Linxx 2010
 - Screens are not integrated with local RMS systems

- Double entry of data is required
 - A “trigger” is needed to remind local agencies to use the screen
- Background Information: See Full Report for CJIN M*ECourt Screens

Option 2: Complete the development of direct file exchange with JCMS system.

- Advantages:
 - Disposition data is a critical element in the Criminal History Cycle and, as such, should be a major focus of any integration efforts
 - IT staff at MTDOJ and SCAO have experience in interfacing CHRI with JCMS data
 - New software for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction is in the process of being installed and it offers new opportunities for linking modern databases
- Challenges:
 - The focus on disposition information as contained in the JCMS databases does not address issues identified outside the court system, issues that affect the exchange of data
 - Older systems may eventually be replaced, requiring new file transfer developments
 - Efforts to create a successful interface with the Court’s system may work best for integration purposes as part of a larger integration effort described in Option 3, below.

Option 3: Create a data warehouse and data exchange utility through the installation of middleware at the state level.

- Advantages:
 - Repositories exist at the state level for CHRS, Corrections and District Courts
 - CJIS Management Working Group is an established body that could be used to support warehousing efforts
 - Data from disparate systems can be transferred automatically on a real-time basis
 - Data could be queried and viewed from the warehouse
- Challenges:
 - Linkage problems have not been solved to allow satisfactory sharing of information between the existing District Court databases
 - A central repository for Courts of Limited Jurisdiction has not been created yet
 - No repository exists for prosecutor data
 - No legislative mandate exists for state warehouse

- Batch file transfers from a variety of local RMS may pose technical and staffing problems
 - Business rules for sharing of information and data specifications would have to be developed
 - Overall status of repository development may delay implementation of this option indefinitely
- Example/Background:
 - Colorado Integrated CJIS Project (See Full Report)

Option 4: Create a web-based middleware application with referral, interfacing, indexing and warehousing capability.

- Advantages:
 - Available to any agency with Internet access
 - Provides an electronic version of the MANS sheet
 - Allows different users to access and update the data throughout the arrest cycle
 - Allows the transfer of MANS data among various agencies with different and disparate records management systems
 - Functionality could be created to automate the exchange of data, allowing both automatic and ad hoc referrals of MANS-related data
 - Data could be queried and viewed from the index and/or warehouse
 - Development could take advantage of existing infrastructure and programs, as well as staff knowledge, within MTDOJ
 - System can be interfaced with current systems or can act as a stand-alone function to provide for the storage and transfer of MANS data
- Challenges:
 - Resources may not be available to develop interfaces with all local systems currently in use
 - Double entry of MANS data will be required when users do not have access to an interface
 - Internet access by local agencies is required
 - Business rules for sharing of information and data specifications would have to be developed
 - A “trigger” must be developed to remind local agencies to input data if an interface has not been created for that agency’s specific records management system

Examples/Background:

Sharing of Public Health Information (SOPHI) Web Application (Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services) (See Full Report)
Wisconsin's Prosecutor System and Integration Efforts (See Full Report)

Problem 2: Improving Flow of Information at the Local Level

Option 1: Provide an integrated system for local law enforcement and prosecuting agencies that will cover all functions from arrest through disposition and will integrate with the state-mandated court systems

- Advantages:
 - Allows smooth transfer of information from arrest through disposition, minimizing or eliminating double entry of key criminal history information for all criminal justice agencies at the local level
 - Allows transfer and access to information which is of interest to local agencies and is not limited to criminal history data (that is, the advantages are far in excess of the transfer of criminal history data for repository purposes)
 - Eliminates gaps in information
 - Can be interfaced with MANS data sharing systems
 - Can be interfaced with state repository for direct file transfer of criminal history data
 - Implementation of an integrated system for local use can maximize the effectiveness of limited IT staff in each local agency
 - Various vendors offer existing products or transfer solutions
- Obstacles/Challenges:
 - Several large jurisdictions have installed RMS systems in recent years or are in the process of implementation; smaller jurisdictions have a variety of different systems in place including a NIBRS-compatible program distributed by the Board of Crime Control
 - Must be interfaced with SCAO-mandated systems
 - Funding has not been identified

Recommendations for MTDOJ Consideration

Administrative recommendations contained in the Phase I report were not changed as a result of meetings with MTDOJ staff during Phase II. These recommendations are summarized below:

-The CJIN access recently installed at the District Court will provide disposition data more rapidly and in an accurate form through the use of the M*ECourt Screens. This

project should be monitored carefully to determine the impact of using this input method on both court procedures and on the compilation of criminal history data.

-The CJIS Bureau should consider reviewing procedures with the goal of streamlining and clarifying state requirements for MANS numbers and MANS sheets.

-The CJIS Bureau has developed audit tools that can be used to identify problems in specific locations by combining site-specific audit findings with activity summaries. Expanded use of these tools is recommended.

-An analysis of reports from the Criminal History Records System can provide additional information for targeting bureau activities according to the impact on the bureau's workload.

-The Bureau should consider making to live scan transmission quality reports more available to a wider group of local agencies since these reports have been used by some agencies to evaluate quality and operation issues, as well as other reports that have been requested by local agencies.

-The CJIS Bureau may want to consider reviewing the legal basis for maintaining certain Title 45 and Title 46 offenses, particularly:

- 46-6-212 Failure to Appear Following Summons or NTA
- 46-6-503 Violation of Release Conditions – Forfeiture
- 46-9-505 Issuance of Arrest Warrant (literal definition of Bail/Bond revocation)
- 46-18-203 Revocation of Suspended or Deferred Sentence
- 46-23-1012 Probation Violation
- Restitution Orders and No Bond Warrants

Additional administrative tasks are time-consuming but could have an immediate impact on the accuracy of data before longer-term solutions are implemented:

-Revise the Administrative Rules (dated 7/01/93) to reflect current law. An example of the outdated material included in these rules is the requirement that MANS numbers be issued for all custodial or felony arrests.

-Revise the Criminal History Record Program (CHRP) Manual to reflect current law and current practices; the last publication date was 7/01/93. This should include standards such as descriptions for charges ("literals").

-Revise the MANS sheet to reflect current requirements and to highlight information that is often missing, and clarify when and how dispositions should be reported to the central repository when a case is being appealed.

-Review ORI assignments to determine if additional assignments should be made.

-Develop summary handouts ("tips") for obtaining MANS numbers and completing MANS sheets; these handouts could be posted at booking areas and other central locations to assist local staff at the time of booking or when the MANS sheet is filled out.

Recommended Next Steps

In the context of statewide CJIS initiatives, the following steps are recommended for further planning and analysis by MTDOJ and its CJIS planning partners.

1. Data Standards and Best Practices: To enhance the goals of integration, the state should consider developing standards for the type and exchange of criminal history data. Some of the local agencies are moving forward with locally integrated systems, and it would be desirable to incorporate statewide standards into these new systems as soon as possible. Data specifications are critical for purposes of successfully exchanging information among all agencies but are particularly important for interfacing with the courts so that arrest and disposition linkage can be improved. Finally, because of the informal nature of current business practices guiding the exchange of data, the development of “best practices” for the exchange among local agencies and to the state is also a critical part of the integration effort.

For planning purposes, a high-level process flow of the movement of MANS sheets has been developed to show the current exchange of MANS data from the local level to the state repository. This process flow is included in Appendix C.

2. Needs Analysis/Feasibility Study: The review of business practices related to data exchange in two counties provided some insights into the types and causes of problems that lead to gaps and inconsistencies in criminal history data. The timeframe available for the analysis did not allow for more thorough and comprehensive review on a statewide basis. MTDOJ may want to consider a Needs Analysis/Feasibility study to fully explore issues and requirements for data exchange in preparation for the development of a preferred technical solution and related CJIS policies and procedures.
3. Refinement of View Tables: Since the time that the data exchange view tables were created for Phase I of the Business Practices Analysis, new information has been obtained regarding the continued development of the SEARCH research model for data exchange points. The dimensions of data exchanges used in the tables and the structure of views used to illustrate exchange points have both continued to evolve. As the SEARCH model becomes more refined, MTDOJ may wish to follow up on the work contained in the Phase I document to support a more detailed analysis of data exchanges in Montana.